



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,160	02/13/2002	Hartmut Strobel	04734-0003	4730

7590 02/25/2004

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

SAEED, KAMAL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,160

Applicant(s)

STROBEL ET AL.

Examiner

Kamal A Saeed

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-20 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 21 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 23 are pending in this application. Claims 7- 20 and 23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The withdrawn subject matter is patentably distinct from the elected subject matter as it differs in structure and element and would require separate search considerations. In addition, a reference which anticipates one group would not render obvious the other.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. The generic concept of the elected subject matter of claims 1-6, 21 and 22 is as follows:

Compound of the structure depicted in, of claim 1, wherein

A and **B**, independently represent CH₂, CHOH or CH-(C₁-C₃-alkyl);


R¹ and **R**⁴, independently represent from the group consisting of H, optionally substituted

C₁-C₁₀-alkyl, C₂-C₁₀-alkenyl or C₂-C₁₀-alkynyl, the substituents of which are as defined **except**

that they don't include a **heteroaryl group**; **R**² and **R**³, independently represent from the group

consisting of H, halogens, optionally substituted C₁-C₁₀-alkyl, the substituents of which are as

are OH or phenyl and they don't include a heteroaryl group; **R**⁵ represents optionally substituted



Benzo[1,3]dioxole group; **R**⁶ and **R**²⁰ are as defined **except** that they don't represent a

heterocyclic group or a group further substituted **heterocyclic group**.

As a result of the election and the corresponding generic concept identified, the remaining subject matter of claims 1-6, 21 and 22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142 (b) as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The withdrawn subject

Art Unit: 1626

matter of claims 1-13 is properly restricted as it differs materially in structure and in element from the elected subject matter supra so as to be patentably distinct there from.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to the restriction requirement. Applicants argue that the restriction requirement does not establish that searching all the inventions would constitute an undue burden to the Patent Office. Applicant traverses the restriction requirement if, once the elected species has been found to be allowable, examination is not expanded to generic claims encompassing the elected species. Applicant also argues that restricting the claims in the manner suggested in the restriction requirement constitutes an undue burden to Applicants as well as the public.

It is pointed out that the restriction requirement is made under 35 U.S.C. 121. 35 U.S.C. 121 gives the Commissioner (Director) the authority to limit the examination of an application where two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed to only one invention. The Examiner has indicated that more than one independent and distinct invention is claimed in this application and has restricted (limited) the claimed subject matter accordingly. For example, the claims encompass heteroaryl groups which are variously classified, therefore "heteroaryl" has been restricted out of the generic embodiment identified for examination. The following is an illustration of the varied classification of the heteroaryl groups: pyrazinyl is classified in class 544 and subclass 336+; pyrimidinyl is classified in class 544 and subclass 242+; pyridinyl is classified in class 546 and subclass 268.1+; oxazolyl is classified in class 548 and subclass 215+; thiazolyl is classified in class 548 and subclass 146+; etc. Thus, the requirement to restrict the

Art Unit: 1626

claims in this application is predicated on the fact that the claimed subject matter involves more than one independent and distinct invention. No where to Applicants argue to the contrary. No where do Applicants point out and give reasons why the claims do not involve independent or distinct subject matter. Accordingly, the restriction is proper. Moreover, it would constitute a burden to extend the search because separate search considerations would be involved in both the U.S. Patents and in the literature. The examination process following the search could easily result in different and thus burdensome considerations.

The restriction requirement here is predicated on the premise that the various compounds involved differ in structure and element so much so as to be patentably distinct, i.e. a reference which anticipated the elected compounds claimed would not even render obvious the others. Again, 35 U.S.C. 121 gives the Commissioner (Director) the authority to limit the examination of an application to a single invention. Applicant has not presented evidence that the examined subject matter is patentably indistinct from the non-examined subject matter. Nor have the even argued to the contrary. Moreover, the sheer number of variables, their huge possibilities, and the almost incomprehensible number of permutations and combinations thereof result in compounds so numerous and diverse so as to be a burden just to classify, search, and examine. Accordingly, the requirement to restrict is considered proper and is maintained. The search and examination of the application is directed to the generic embodiment identified for examination only. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1626

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i). Weyer et al, US 3,835,188

Therefore, the objection of claims 1-6, 21 and 22 in the office action mailed May 09, 2003 is maintained.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-6, 21 and 22 objected to for containing non-elected subject matter.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kamal Saeed whose telephone number is (571) 272-0705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM – 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699.

Communication via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 1626

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2286.

Kamal Saeed
Kamal Saeed, Ph.D
Patent Examiner AU 1626
02/21/04